



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Of about *two hundred and fifty* "persons of property," *one hundred and seventy* of them country gentlemen, to whom that printed letter was addressed, not one, yourself excepted, has, so far as I know, been disposed to entertain any dread of the consequences. Part, indeed, have not thought it necessary to return an answer, as in case of a serious fear of danger, it is to be presumed they would have done. Some few entertain slight shades of difference in opinion; and several express themselves in terms too flattering for me to repeat.

I have, however, other grounds for knowing that, among gentlemen, there is a much greater change of *opinion* on the *necessity* of radical reform than general conduct should indicate. It is in that class of the community more than in the lower classes, that a larger proportion wish for, than actually promote, such reform; and for reasons very easily imagined.

I wish it were otherwise; because when calamity from ill government have depressed the spirits of the people, and the difficulties hitherto attending the pursuit of reform, have caused too much despondence, too much fear of the hopelessness of exertion, the enlightened of "the upper classes" cannot, in my judgment, better manifest their genuine patriotism, and better provide for the public tranquillity, than by convincing the aggrieved and gloomy people, that redress is not to be had by a subversion, but by a reformation of the government; than by *encouraging* them not to despair, but to *petition*.

With sincere thanks for the good intentions of your lecture, but with an earnest wish, that you would place a firm reliance in your knowledge of the science of civil Government and the English Constitution, that is, in the true principles of REPRESENTATION, of truth and justice; despising the shallow prejudices of the proud and ignorant, as well as the insolence of the corrupt, I remain, dear Sir, with great sincerity, your friend and servant,

Dec. 5d, 1812.

J. CARTWRIGHT.

The readers of the foregoing Letter, to which I never received any other answer than what appears in the *accusatory* and *angry* passages of the Address to the Freeholders of Yorkshire, of the 15th of October, 1813, may now, perhaps, be able to resolve for themselves the two following questions, namely,

1st. In addressing the freeholders of Yorkshire, on the subject of Parliamentary reform, could it have been in any degree *necessary*, to have introduced those *accusatory* and *angry* passages at all, or any thing of the kind?

2d. Do those passages contain a just *portrait*, moral, political, or intellectual, of the writer of the foregoing Letter; or a just representation, in particular, of his *motives* for recommending in the "disturbed counties" precisely the same form of petition as he recommended in all other counties through which he passed, or any argument for showing either the impropriety or the impolicy of so acting? J. C.

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE CONNECTED WITH THE RETROSPECT OF POLITICS.

To the Proprietors of the Belfast Magazine.

GENTLEMEN,

THE following reply to Crito-Philos-Crito, I sent a few days ago to the Editor of the Belfast News-Letter, requesting him to insert it in his paper, in order that his readers (who are not readers of the Magazine) might have the opportunity of hearing both sides; but he, with that illiberality and want of candour, which I am sorry to say distinguishes him, refused to give it publicity. For his reasons I have only to refer to his note

to correspondents in his paper of the 18th instant.

On his declining to publish my remarks, I sent the article to the Editor of the Chronicle, mentioning to him that it had been offered to the other newspaper for publication, and had been refused. From him I received a long letter, stating, that as the Chronicle had not made itself a party in the controversy, it would appear invidious to publish a censure on a contemporary; at the same time, acknowledging that the Belfast Magazine was a credit to Belfast; its proprietors entitled to his respect; and that if the articles sign-

ed Crito and Philo-Crito, had appeared in his paper, my communication should have been published. Such, gentlemen, is the state of the news-paper press in your town. If one makes an attack upon you, he will not publish your reply, and because the controversy has not originated with the other, he will not publish any thing which may contain a censure upon a contemporary. Whatever weight may be given by the public be attached to the reasons given by the Editor of the Chronicle, when they read the following article, they will then be enabled to judge of the candour and liberality of the Editor of the News-letter.

Feb. 26, 1814.

To the Editor of the Belfast News-Letter.

SIR,

THE two articles signed Crito and Philo-Crito, which appeared in your paper of the 8th and 11th instant, are written so much in the violence of party spirit, and are so expressive of rancour against the conductors of a work, which, however it may differ from your correspondents in politics, must be allowed to be respectable, that I am induced to step forward in the cause of truth, and of temperate free discussion. My remarks, I hope you will in justice to yourself, as well as to that cause, give to the public, as it is difficult to judge of the real merits of the case by only hearing one side.

I cannot help believing that both publications are by the same hand, but whether or not I am mistaken in that point, to save time and paper, I shall take it for granted, and observe upon both at the same time.

You sir, are congratulated for having fallen under the lash of the writer of the Monthly Retrospect of Politics, in the Belfast Magazine, and you are advised and encouraged to continue to deserve his censure. That you have been reflected on by that writer, must be admitted, and that he has blamed you for the manner in which you detailed the transaction of disinterring the dead body is very true. Yet I am convinced that you have not a sincere friend in this world who would not rather have seen your cause otherwise defended. No man who values the News-Letter or its Editor but would prefer having the cause of either defended with good temper and good manners, to having the defence, such as it is, conceived in terms of ran-

corous and abusive scurrility. Such modes either of attack or defence, always defeat their own purposes, and instead of carrying conviction to the mind of the reader, excite sentiments of contempt and abhorrence against the writer.

On an impartial and dispassionate review of the subject, it appears that the exceptions taken to your account of the transaction, were in consequence of your sinking the circumstance of the Orange procession at the funeral, and making no remarks upon the extreme impropriety of such procession: it being merely stated, that the man had been a yeoman, and was buried with military honours, when it was notorious that at the funeral, "all the pomp and circumstance" of an Orange procession were displayed. I have no doubt but that you published the account as you received it, and possibly you might have been unacquainted with the fact of the Orange procession; but if otherwise, it certainly was your duty as an impartial journalist, to state the whole fully and clearly, nor can you stand excused if that circumstance was known to you. Whether however, the statement was drawn up for you, or that you wrote it yourself, it must appear to an impartial reader, that by the manner in which it is done, there was a consciousness that the procession was improper, and that it was that consciousness which prevented it being mentioned. If it is thought fit and proper by Orangemen to walk in procession at the funeral of a deceased brother, it is mere pusillanimity to attempt hiding it in a newspaper statement. The attempt at throwing a veil over that part of the transaction, clearly shews that they were in their own minds convinced that it was the procession which provoked the deed; and it also shows that the execration of the public would be more readily excited by simply stating that the man was buried with military honours, than if they had said he "had been a member of a yeomanry corps" and also an Orangeman; that "his remains were accompanied to the grave by a considerable number of yeomen," and a numerous body of Orangemen, with all the insignia of that order, who walked in procession, and "buried him with military honours." Burying a man with military honours they well knew could give offence to no man, or party of men, but they were as sensible that after the unhappy occur-